



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,091	06/04/2001	Deborah Charych	1680.002	6042

7590

12/21/2005

Chiron Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law Department  
Mail Stop R-3  
PO Box 8097  
Emeryville, CA 94662

EXAMINER

TRAN, MY CHAU T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1639

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



**DETAILED ACTION**

***Application and Claims Status***

1. Applicant's amendment and response filed 10/03/2005 is acknowledged and entered.  
Claims 1, 73, and 99-101 have been amended.
2. The amendment filed on 04/06/2005: cancelled claims 92-96; amended claims 1 and 73; and added claims 97-101.
3. The amendment filed on 07/30/2004: amended claims 1, and 73; and added claims 92-96.
4. The amendment filed on 03/18/2004: cancelled claims 55-59 and 74-78; and amended claims 1, 60-61, 72-73, and 79-80.
5. The amendment filed on 06/30/2003: cancelled claims 2-20, and 53; amended claim 1; and added claims 55-91.
6. The amendment filed on 12/09/2002: cancelled claims 21-52, and 54; and amended claims 3, 9, 16, and 20.
7. Claims 1, 60-73, 79-91, and 97-101 are pending.
8. Claims 1, 60-73, 79-91, and 97-101 are under consideration in this Office Action.

***Priority***

9. This instant application claims benefit to a provisional application of 60/209,711 filed 06/05/2000. This instant application is granted the benefit of priority for 60/209,711 under 35 U.S.C 119(e).

***New Rejection(s) – Necessitated by Amendment***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. Claims 1, 60-72, and 99-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

The instant invention recites an array. The array comprises a) a solid substrate having a substantially planar surface comprising a layer of aluminum formed on a glass base material, the aluminum coated with a silicon dioxide coating having a thickness of between about 200 and 900Å; and b) a plurality of different protein-binding agents bound to said substrate. Each of said protein-binding agents comprises 1) an anchoring segment stably bound to the substrate surface; 2) a peptidomimetic protein-binding segment; and 3) a linker segment connecting and separating the anchoring and peptidomimetic segments. The array does not define a diffraction grating

Art Unit: 1639

from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained.

The recitation of the 'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained' claimed in claim 1, have no clear support in the specification and the claims as originally filed. The instant specification is silent on the newly added limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'* and the newly added term "diffraction grating". While there is no in haec verba requirement, newly added claim limitations must be supported in the specification through express, implicit, or inherent disclosure. See MPEP § 2163 I(b). No such supports were found for the newly added limitations. Additionally, any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. See MPEP § 2173.05(i). Furthermore, the instant drawing, i.e. figures 9-11, and disclosure, i.e. page 37, line 15 thru pg. 38, line 8, disclose that the array does *'define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'*, which is a positive recitation of the instant claimed array. Therefore, the scope of the invention as originally disclosed in the specification would not encompass the scope of the newly added limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'*.

If applicants disagree, applicant should present a detailed analysis as to why the claimed subject matter has clear support in the specification.

Art Unit: 1639

12. Claims 73, 79-91, 97, and 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

The instant invention recites a kit. The kit comprises an array and one or more reagents for conducting a differential binding assay. The array comprises a) a solid substrate having a substantially planar surface comprising a layer of aluminum formed on a glass base material, the aluminum coated with a silicon dioxide coating having a thickness of between about 200 and 900Å; and b) a plurality of different protein-binding agents bound to said substrate. Each of said protein-binding agents comprises 1) an anchoring segment stably bound to the substrate surface; 2) a peptidomimetic protein-binding segment; and 3) a linker segment connecting and separating the anchoring and peptidomimetic segments. The array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained. The reagent comprises a plurality of fluorescent labels for proteins.

The recitation of the 'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained' claimed in claim 73, have no clear support in the specification and the claims as originally filed. The instant specification is silent on the newly added limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'* and the

Art Unit: 1639

newly added term “diffraction grating”. While there is no in haec verba requirement, newly added claim limitations must be supported in the specification through express, implicit, or inherent disclosure. See MPEP § 2163 I(b). No such supports were found for the newly added limitations. Additionally, any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. See MPEP § 2173.05(i). Furthermore, the instant drawing, i.e. figures 9-11, and disclosure, i.e. page 37, line 15 thru pg. 38, line 8, disclose that the array does ‘*define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained*’, which is a positive recitation of the instant claimed array. Therefore, the scope of the invention as originally disclosed in the specification would not encompass the scope of the newly added limitation that the ‘*array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained*’.

If applicants disagree, applicant should present a detailed analysis as to why the claimed subject matter has clear support in the specification.

***Withdrawn Objection(s) and /or Rejection(s)***

13. The objection of claims 99-101 has been withdrawn in light of applicant’s amendments of claims 99-101.

14. The rejection of claims 1, 60-61, 63-66 and 99-101 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Gustafson et al. (US Patent 5,478,527) and Chenchik et al. (US Patent 6,087,102) has been withdrawn in view of applicant’s amendments of claim 1, i.e. the newly added

Art Unit: 1639

limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'*. However since the newly added limitations have found no support in the specification, the withdrawn prior art rejections could be reinstated if claim 1 is amended to remove the newly added limitations.

15. The rejection of claims 62 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Gustafson et al. (US Patent 5,478,527) and Chenchik et al. (US Patent 6,087,102) as applied to claims 1, 60-61, 63-66 and 99-101, and further in view of Wagner et al. (US Patent 6,329,209 B1) has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments of claim 1, i.e. the newly added limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'*. However since the newly added limitations have found no support in the specification, the withdrawn prior art rejections could be reinstated if claim 1 is amended to remove the newly added limitations.

16. The rejection of claims 67-72 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Gustafson et al. (US Patent 5,478,527) and Chenchik et al. (US Patent 6,087,102) as applied to claims 1, 60-61, 63-66 and 99-101, and further in view of Barrett et al (US Patent 5,482,867) has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments of claim 1, i.e. the newly added limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'*. However



Art Unit: 1639

since the newly added limitations have found no support in the specification, the withdrawn prior art rejections could be reinstated if claim 1 is amended to remove the newly added limitations.

17. The rejection of claims 73, 79-80, 82-85, 97, and 98 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Gustafson et al. (US Patent 5,478,527) and Chenchik et al. (US Patent 6,087,102) has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments of claim 73, i.e. the newly added limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'*. However since the newly added limitations have found no support in the specification, the withdrawn prior art rejections could be reinstated if claim 73 is amended to remove the newly added limitations.

18. The rejection of claims 81 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Gustafson et al. (US Patent 5,478,527) and Chenchik et al. (US Patent 6,087,102) as applied to claims 73, 79-80, 82-85, 97, and 98 above, and further in view of Wagner et al. (US Patent 6,329,209 B1) has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments of claim 73, i.e. the newly added limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'*. However since the newly added limitations have found no support in the specification, the withdrawn prior art rejections could be reinstated if claim 73 is amended to remove the newly added limitations.

Art Unit: 1639

19. The rejection of claims 86-91 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Gustafson et al. (US Patent 5,478,527) and Chenchik et al. (US Patent 6,087,102) as applied to claims 73, 79-80, 82-85, 97, and 98 above, and further in view of Barrett et al (US Patent 5,482,867) has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments of claim 73, i.e. the newly added limitation that the *'array does not define a diffraction grating from which a diffracted light signal indicating the presence of a protein bound to one or more of the protein binding agents is obtained'*. However since the newly added limitations have found no support in the specification, the withdrawn prior art rejections could be reinstated if claim 73 is amended to remove the newly added limitations.

### ***Conclusion***

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1639

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to My-Chau T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-0810. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday: 8:00-2:30; Tuesday-Thursday: 7:30-5:00; Friday: 8:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Wang can be reached on 571-272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mct  
December 14, 2005

  
PADMAASHRI PONNALURI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER